

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-8 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Wu (U.S. Patent No. 6,454,599). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Wu shows a printed circuit card connector having a housing (1) with the first bearing portion (17) and the second bearing portion (35) integral with the housing and resiliently connected to enable the bearing portions to move relative to each other, the bearing portions being spaced apart, the first bearing portion being carried by a rigid partition. The second bearing portion has at least one bearing member carried at the end of an arm which is secured to a flexible blade (32). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's understanding of the Wu reference.

The Examiner has stated that the second bearing portion (35) is integral with the housing. This is clearly not the case since grounding bridge (3) is shown as a separate part which is slid into grooves (171, 172 and 162). Thus, it cannot be integral with the housing. Further, the Examiner has stated that leg portions (32) are secured to a flexible blade. Applicants disagree that this element is flexible. It is not flexible in the vertical direction since this is metal and since it is prevented from bending by the flanges (38). Further, Applicants submit that the Examiner is incorrect in these statements and that the claim defines over this reference.

KM/RFG/kam

Further, Applicants question whether engagement arm (17) can be considered a rigid partition. A partition typically divides a space, which area is not the case with engagement arm (17). That is, these arms do not extend downwardly to separate one space from another. In the present invention, the partition (7) extends downwardly almost to the card so as to form a true partition. Further, it is noted that the Examiner has referred to engagement arm (17) as both the partition and the first bearing portion. Applicants suggest that this element cannot be both. Further, it is noted that the claim describes that the arm is connected to the flexible blade in a central zone thereof. In the reference, the legs are not in the central zone, but rather one is near the outer end while the other is close to the intermediate portion (33). For these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not obvious over this reference.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features that make them additionally allowable. Thus, claim 2 now describes the positioning peg which is separate from the bearing portions. The Examiner has equated the positioning peg (9) with the post (174). However, this post has already been equated with the first bearing portion. Applicants have amended claim 2 to make it clear that these two parts are separate from each other. Further, Applicants submit that claim 2 is similarly allowable.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have also added new dependent claims 5-8 to further define the invention. New claim 5 describes the partition as being planar and perpendicular to the card. Applicants submit that extension arm (17) is not planar and is not perpendicular to the card. Claim 6 describes the arms as being resilient in a direction parallel to the front face of the housing. As

KM/RFG/kam

noted in Figure 1, the arms are resilient in the direction parallel to the front face of the housing, which is also the direction between the two partitions. This differs from the Wu reference where the arms are resilient in the direction perpendicular to that of the present invention, that is it extends to and away from the housing.

Claim 7 has now been added which describes the flexible blade as being flexible in the direction to and away from the card. This is clearly not the case with any part of the Wu device.

Claim 8 describes the arms as being at a similar distance from the housing. This differs from the Wu reference where the arms extend away from the housing at different distances.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that new dependent claims 4-8 are similarly allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse, Reg. No. 27,2795, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 1, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Mundy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

KM/RFG/kam